



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,288	06/20/2003	Alan K. Schaer	CRDIP-02101	1511
90944	7590	08/05/2011	EXAMINER	
Edward J. Lynch			COHEN, LEE S	
Four Embarcadero Center			ART UNIT	
Suite 1700			PAPER NUMBER	
San Francisco, CA 94111			3739	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/05/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/601,288

Applicant(s)

SCHAER, ALAN K.

Examiner

Lee S. Cohen

Art Unit

3739

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 and 54-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52, 54-60 and 64-67 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 61-63 and 68-79 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Reissue Applications

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1), a supplemental reissue oath/declaration under 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1) must be received before this reissue application can be allowed.

Claims 62, 63, and 68-79 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue declaration under 35 U.S.C. 251. See 37 CFR 1.175. The nature of the defect is set forth above.

Receipt of an appropriate supplemental oath/declaration under 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1) will overcome this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 251. An example of acceptable language to be used in the supplemental oath/declaration is as follows:

"Every error in the patent which was corrected in the present reissue application, and is not covered by a prior oath/declaration submitted in this application, arose without any deceptive intention on the part of the applicant."

See MPEP § 1414.01.

Claim Objections

Claim 62 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim employs bracketing which is improper under 37 CFR 1.173. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Panescu et al (5,769,847) in view of Nashef et al (5,682,899) and further in view of Littman et al (5,509,411).

Applicant's attention is directed to columns 5-8 in Panescu et al and, in particular, the figure 9 embodiment. Panescu et al also disclose at column 6, lines 28-32, that the electrodes can be as small as 4 French (1.35 mm) in diameter and have lengths varying from about 2 mm to about 10 mm. Adjacent electrodes are spaced no farther apart than about 2.5 times an electrode diameter. Accordingly, the electrode spacing can be within the claimed range. The reference further discloses a core member 28 that extends into a jacket (see Figure 8).

Nashef et al disclose the use of a metal band about a temperature sensor to improve its performance. Applicant's attention is directed to Figure 1, elements 19 and 20. Given this teaching, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to incorporate a metal band in Panescu et al to effect superior temperature sensing. Further, the process by which the band is attached to the temperature sensor is within the level of skill for the artisan to select to optimize performance.

Littman et al disclose the use of braided helical conductors in a shaft that partially covers the electrodes as well as the particular core structure to have been well known in the art. The reference also discloses the use of a distal tip coil member. Given these teachings, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to incorporate these features in the Panescu et al device to render it more flexible and maneuverable.

Claims 62, 63, and 68-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Panescu et al (5,769,847) in view of Nashef et al (5,682,899) and Littman et al (5,509,411), as detailed supra, and further in view of Cosman (4,966,597). The combination clearly discloses the embedding of electrode conductors in the shaft but does not specifically disclose the similar incorporation of temperature sensor wires in the shaft. Cosman clearly discloses such a feature in

Figures 1-3 which show such wires in the shaft wall. Given this teaching, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to incorporate such a feature in the combination since a predictable result would ensue.

With respect to claims 68 and 69, the recited methods are deemed to be obvious over the Panescu et al reference. Detecting electrical activity with the electrodes after delivering ablation energy is conventional in the art and would have been an obvious step. Further, the Panescu et al method encompasses delivering of energy to the electrodes in various patterns (i.e., sequential) to achieve optimum lesion formation

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claim 61 has not been amended and therefore the rejection of record with respect to the claim is still deemed to be proper. Applicant's arguments with respect to the other rejected claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lee S. Cohen whose telephone number is 571-272-4763. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on 571-272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Lee S. Cohen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3739

/Lee S. Cohen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3739
April 6, 2011